



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Pusheta Township
Auglaize County
14002 Pusheta Road
Wapakoneta, Ohio 45895

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of Pusheta Township (the Township) agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transactions; and management and the Board are responsible for complying with the compliance requirements. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the Comptroller General of the United States' Government Auditing Standards. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

Cash and Investments

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 bank reconciliation. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2012 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2011 balance documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the January 1, 2013 beginning fund balances recorded in the Cash Journal to the December 31, 2012 balances in the Cash Journal. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliation to the total of the December 31, 2013 and 2012 fund cash balances reported in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2013 bank account balances with the Township's financial institution. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2013 cash book balance without exception.
5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2013 bank reconciliation:
 - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
 - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the check register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

Cash and Investments (Continued)

6. We tested investments held at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 to determine that they:
 - a. Were of a type authorized by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 135.13, 135.14 or 135.144. We found no exceptions.
 - b. Mature within the prescribed time limits noted in Ohio Rev. Code Section 135.13 or 135.14. We noted no exceptions.

Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2013 and one from 2012:
 - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Cash Journal. The amounts agreed.
 - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper funds as required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.05-.06 and 5705.10. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Cash Journal to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2013 and 2012. We noted the Cash Journal included the proper number of tax receipts for each year.
3. We selected all four receipts from the State Distribution Transaction Lists (DTL) from 2013 and all four from 2012. We also selected five receipts from the Auglaize County Auditor's Vendor Detail Report from 2013 and five from 2012.
 - a. We compared the amount from the above reports to the amount recorded in the Cash Journal. One receipt from the 2012 State Distribution Transaction List in the amount of \$14 was not recorded in the Cash Journal.
 - b. We determined whether these receipts were allocated to the proper funds. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

Debt

1. From the prior agreed-upon procedures documentation, we noted the following capital lease outstanding as of December 31, 2011. These amounts agreed to the Townships January 1, 2012 balances on the summary we used in step 3.

Issue	Principal outstanding as of December 31, 2011:
Capital Lease – Truck	\$58,715.04

2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Cash Journal for evidence of debt issued during 2013 or 2012 or debt payment activity during 2013 or 2012. All debt noted agreed to the summary we used in step 3. We noted no new debt issuances.

Debt (Continued)

3. We obtained a summary of capital lease activity for 2013 and 2012 and agreed principal and interest payments from the related debt amortization schedule to Gasoline Tax fund payments reported in the Cash Journal. We also compared the date the debt service payments were due to the date the Township made the payments. We noted that the due dates on the lease were March 1, 2012 and March 1, 2013 and payments were made on March 7, 2012 and March 5, 2013 respectively.

Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2013 and one payroll check for five employees from 2012 from the Payroll Record and:
 - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Payroll Record to supporting documentation (legislatively or statutorily-approved salary). We found no exceptions.
 - b. We recomputed gross and net pay and agreed it to the amount recorded in the Payroll Record. We found no exceptions.
 - c. We determined whether the fund and account codes to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record or as required by statute. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2013 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2013. We noted the following:

Withholding (plus employer share, where applicable)	Date Due	Date Paid	Amount Due	Amount Paid
Federal income taxes & Medicare	January 31, 2014	12/31/13	\$251.74	\$251.74
State income taxes	January 15, 2014	12/31/13	\$103.95	\$103.95
OPERS retirement	January 30, 2014	12/31/13	\$928.20	\$928.20

3. For the pay periods ended July 31, 2013 and October 31, 2012, we recomputed the allocation of the Boards' salaries to the General and Road and Bridge Fund per the Payroll Record. We noted that for these pay periods the Board's salaries were paid 100% to the Road and Bridge fund and none to the General Fund per the Appropriation Ledger.
4. For the pay periods described in the preceding step, we traced the Boards' salary for time or services performed to supporting certifications the Revised Code requires. We noted that the Boards salaries were allocated 100% to the Road and Bridge Fund. The certifications for those pay periods specify allocating 5% to the general fund and 95% to the Road and Bridge Fund. As of both year ends per the signed certifications, the Township ended up allocating \$849 more each year to the General Fund than from the restricted fund.

Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements

1. From the Appropriation Ledger, we re-footed checks recorded as General Fund disbursements for general government, and checks recorded as public works in the gasoline tax special revenue fund for 2013. We found no exceptions.
2. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Appropriations Ledger for the year ended December 31, 2013 and ten from the year ended 2012 and determined whether:
 - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
 - b. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the check number, date, payee name and amount recorded in the Appropriation Ledger and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
 - c. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the restricted purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
 - d. The fiscal officer certified disbursements requiring certification or issued a *Then and Now Certificate*, as required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(D). We found no exceptions.

Compliance – Budgetary

1. We compared the total estimated receipts from the Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.36(A)(1), to the amounts recorded in the receipts ledger for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. The amounts on the *Certificate* did not agree to the amount recorded in the receipts journal for either year as no estimated receipts were recorded in the receipts journal. The fiscal officer should periodically compare amounts recorded in the Receipts Journal to amounts recorded on the *Amended Official Certificate of Estimated Resources* to assure they agree. If the amounts do not agree, the Trustees may be using inaccurate information for budgeting and monitoring purposes.
2. We scanned the appropriation measures adopted for 2013 and 2012 to determine whether, for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds, the Trustees appropriated separately for "each office, department, and division, and within each, the amount appropriated for personal services," as is required by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.38(C). We found no exceptions.
3. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.38 and 5705.40, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger for 2013 and 2012 for the following funds: General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Ledger.
4. Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.36(A)(5) and 5705.39 prohibits appropriations from exceeding the certified resources. We compared total appropriations to total certified resources for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012. We noted no funds for which appropriations exceeded certified resources.
5. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.41(B) prohibits expenditures (disbursements plus certified commitments) from exceeding appropriations. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 for the General, Gasoline Tax, and Road and Bridge funds, as recorded in the Appropriations Ledger. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

Compliance – Budgetary (Continued)

6. Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 requires establishing separate funds to segregate externally-restricted resources. We scanned the Receipts Ledger for evidence of new restricted receipts requiring a new fund during December 31, 2013 and 2012. We also inquired of management regarding whether the Township received new restricted receipts. We noted no evidence of new restricted receipts for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.09 would require the Township to establish a new fund.
7. We scanned the 2013 and 2012 receipts ledger and appropriation ledger for evidence of interfund transfers exceeding \$100 which Ohio Rev. Code Sections 5705.14 - .16 restrict. We found no evidence of transfers these Sections prohibit, or for which Section 5705.16 would require approval by the Tax Commissioner and Court of Common Pleas.
8. We inquired of management and scanned the appropriations ledger to determine whether the Township elected to establish reserve accounts permitted by Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.13. We noted the Township did not establish these reserves.

Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures

We inquired of management and scanned the appropriations ledger for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 to determine if the township proceeded by force account (i.e. used its own employees) to maintain or repair roads (cost of project \$15,000-\$45,000) or to construct or reconstruct township roads (cost of project \$5,000-\$15,000/per mile) for which Ohio Rev. Code Section 5575.01 requires the county engineer to complete a force account project assessment form (i.e., cost estimate). We identified no projects requiring the county engineer to complete a force account cost estimate.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Township's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, and others within the Township, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

Columbus, Ohio

April 9, 2014

This page intentionally left blank.



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

PUSHETA TOWNSHIP

AUGLAIZE COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
MAY 8, 2014**